REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. Claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 27 and 31 are amended. These amendments correct minor typographical errors. No new subject matter is believed to have been added by these amendments.

The Examiner has allowed claims 9, 10, 12 and 15-34.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) for anticipation by United States Patent No. 5,974,706 to Kaczmarski et al. (hereinafter the Kaczmarski '706 patent). In view of the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

According to independent claim 1, the present invention is directed to a demolition equipment system. The system includes a plurality of separate and distinct equipment bases. Each equipment base forms a part of a separate and distinct demolition equipment unit. Each equipment base includes a support frame receiver. The support frame receivers are similarly configured. The system further includes a plurality of separate and distinct claw tines. Each claw tine includes a support frame configured to engage any of the support frame receivers such that each claw tine is selectively and removably attachable to any of the separate and distinct equipment bases. Thus, each claw tine is capable of forming a part of each separate and distinct demolition equipment unit. Each claw tine is movable between an open and closed position.

The Kaczmarski '706 patent is directed to a bracket and frame assembly that permits attaching and removing a bucket or other tool to and from an arm of an excavator, a backhoe, or the like. The Kaczmarski '706 patent teaches a quick attachment bracket on the equipment base. However, when the invention of the Kaczmarski '706 patent is used with a grapple, as outlined in column 7 beginning on line 25, the grapple teeth are mounted on a wall assembly and the wall assembly is then attached to the quick attachment mounting bracket.

Application No. 09/936,664

Paper Dated September 21, 2004

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 21, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 2005-011339

In contrast, independent claim 1 requires a plurality of separate and distinct

claw tines where each claw tine includes a support frame configured to engage any of the

support frame receivers of the equipment bases. The Kaczmarski '706 patent does not teach

or suggest that each grapple tooth includes a support frame configured to attach to an

equipment base such that each claw tine is individually removable from the equipment base.

While the Kaczmarski '706 patent may teach a grapple as a unit that is attachable to an

equipment base, it does not teach or suggest individual tines that can be individually attached

to the base.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes that the subject matter of

independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the Kaczmarski '706 patent. Reconsideration of the

rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 depends from and adds further limitations to independent claim 1 and

is believed to be patentable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with

independent claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 3-8, 11, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for

obviousness over the Kaczmarski '706 patent in view of United States Patent No. 6,155,619

to Kirkpatrick et al. (hereinafter the Kirkpatrick patent). In view of the following remarks,

the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

Independent claim 1 was discussed hereinabove.

According to independent claim 11, the present invention is directed to a claw

tine for demolition equipment. The claw tine includes an elongated claw tine body pivotally

movable about a pivot point between an open position and a closed position. A support

frame is located at a proximal end of the claw tine body and is configured to engage a support

frame receiver of the demolition equipment. A claw tine is located at a distal end of the claw

Page 11 of 13

{W0142681.1}

Application No. 09/936,664

Paper Dated September 21, 2004

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 21, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 2005-011339

tine body. A hydraulic cylinder is provided for moving the claw tine body between the open

position and the closed position. The hydraulic cylinder has a fixed end secured to a base and

a cylinder rod end secured to the claw tine body. The total angular rotation of the claw tine

body between the open position and the closed position is at least 75 degrees.

The Kaczmarski '706 patent was discussed hereinabove. The Kaczmarski '706

patent does not teach or suggest a claw tine including a support frame for attaching to a

support frame receiver of demolition equipment. While the Kaczmarski '706 patent may

teach a grapple as a unit that is attachable to an equipment base, it does not teach or suggest

individual tines that can be individually attached to the base.

The Kirkpatrick patent teaches that three-tine and four-tine grapples are

known in the art. The existence of two-, three-, and four-tine grapples in the prior art is not

disputed. However, the Kirkpatrick patent does not cure the deficiencies, discussed above, of

the Kaczmarski '706 patent.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes that the subject matter of

independent claims 1 and 11 is not rendered obvious by the Kaczmarski '706 patent in view

of the Kirkpatrick patent. Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 is respectfully

requested.

Claims 3-8 depend from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 or

a subsequent dependent claim and are believed to be patentable for the reasons discussed

hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejections of

claims 3-8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from and add further limitations to independent

claim 11 and are believed to be patentable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in

connection with independent claim 11. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 13 and 14

is respectfully requested.

Page 12 of 13

{W0142681.1}

Application No. 09/936,664 Paper Dated September 21, 2004 In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 21, 2004 Attorney Docket No. 2005-011339

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of pending claims 1-34 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.

Richard L. Byrne

Mard hohym Registration No. 28,498 Attorney for Applicant 700 Koppers Building 436 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1818

Telephone: 412-471-8815 Facsimile: 412-471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com